

## ISSP study monitoring 2004: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany

Scholz, Evi; Harkness, Janet; Faaß, Timo

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Verzeichnis, Liste, Dokumentation / list

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Scholz, E., Harkness, J., & Faaß, T. (2008). *ISSP study monitoring 2004: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany*. (GESIS-Methodenberichte, 2/2008). Mannheim: GESIS-ZUMA. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-206860>

### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

### Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

***GESIS-Methodenberichte Nr. 2/2008***

**ISSP Study Monitoring 2004  
Report to the ISSP General Assembly  
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP  
by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany**

Evi Scholz, Janet Harkness and Timo Faaß  
March 2008

GESIS-ZUMA  
Quadrat B2, 1  
Postfach 12 21 55  
D- 68072 Mannheim

Telephone: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-283  
Telefax: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-100  
E-mail: [evi.scholz@gesis.org](mailto:evi.scholz@gesis.org)

**GESIS-Methodenberichte**

Die GESIS ist ein Institut der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft.

ISSN:  
Herausgeber, Druck  
und Vertrieb:

1865-7575  
GESIS  
Postfach 12 21 55, 68072 Mannheim

Printed in Germany

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Summary of the findings .....	5
Language(s) and translation .....	5
Survey question coverage and context .....	5
Sampling .....	6
Data collection .....	6
Information on response and outcome figures .....	7
Data .....	8
Documentation .....	8
References .....	8
Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2004 .....	10
Monitoring Findings Chart .....	14
Appendix .....	50
Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures .....	52
ISSP Study Monitoring Questionnaires for Face-to-Face and Mail Surveys .....	53

## Introduction

Standards of “best practices for survey and public opinion research” such as published by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) call for quality checks at each stage of the survey process lifecycle. Defining standards and establishing benchmarks for good or best practices is an important step towards enabling quality to be assessed. A similarly critical step involves defining the criteria by which one or the other category or standard is to be defined. The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) guidelines on best practices and its definitions of nonresponse (The American Association for Public Opinion Research 2006) are good examples of such guidelines and definitions. Without documentation, however, quality assessment is impossible and quality improvement unlikely (Harkness 1999, Mohler and Uher 2003). Reporting outcomes is also a useful way of encouraging improvement in procedures (Lynn 2001). In numerous instances, the ISSP Study Monitoring documentation has resulted in improved standards in the ISSP.

Study monitoring involves collecting information on study design and every stage of implementation, requiring researchers to disclose their procedures and outcomes. If conducted while a study is happening, monitoring is the key to intervention which can reduce survey error. It is critical in controlling the quality of procedures and outcomes and plays an important role in helping projects improve design and implementation. Timely and ongoing lifecycle process monitoring is an important tool to reduce survey error during the relevant stage of implementation, whether this be design, data collection or data editing. However, as Mohler, Pennell and Hubbard (2008) note; “Standards in survey documentation have evolved in parallel with the technological and methodological developments in survey research. In just a few decades, paper documents describing the contents of rectangular data files (i.e., codebooks) have been replaced with on-line access to documents that both describe and facilitate analysis of complex hierarchical and/or relational databases. Despite these advances, examples of complete or even adequate survey documentation remain surprisingly rare.”

Cross-national Study Monitoring as pioneered in the ISSP represents a special case of survey documentation and study monitoring. ISSP Study Monitoring and Study Monitoring Reports as carried out by GESIS-ZUMA is monitoring *after the event*. The aim of ISSP monitoring and reports is at least twofold. From the beginning (cf. Park and Jowell 1997), one goal was to monitor and record for internal ISSP purposes how ISSP studies were conducted in each country and how implementations met or failed to meet ISSP requirements as defined by the ISSP Working Principles. These aims are related to the pursuit of basic good or best practices in ISSP studies but also to comparability of data across ISSP datasets. Data quality in cross-

national studies is not only a matter of quality procedures but also of comparability across data sets and across the procedures resulting in these data sets (Harkness 1999, Mohler and Uher 2003, Scholz and Klein 2003). Comparability in this context operates on many levels (cf. Lyberg et al. 1997, Lynn et al. 2006, Harkness 2008).

For users of ISSP data, the Study Monitoring Reports bring together information of relevance for analysis not otherwise available in such compact form. The documentation provided on major aspects of each member's fielding and outcomes goes a considerable way towards guiding researchers on which differences between ISSP countries they might ignore and which they should consider. We note that the study documentation available for the European Social Survey, supported by EU funding and introduced in a different historical context, has benefited from but also goes beyond the documentation provided by the ISSP.

The ISSP is a collaborative academic survey programme with members from all over the world collaborating to construct and conduct an annual module on a topic important for social science research. The programme was started 1984/1985 by researchers from four General Social Surveys; in 2006 it now has 41 member countries.

Figure 1 lists the current ISSP members and illustrates which different cultural contexts ISSP covers nowadays.

Figure 1: ISSP Member Countries 2006



The following report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by GESIS-ZUMA for the ISSP on the 2004 Citizenship module.

Thirty-eight member countries archived the 2004 Citizenship module, all of them have completed the monitoring questionnaire. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary chart which follows here. We have done our best to summarise the answers we received and to check the information with members. Members were given the opportunity to make corrections before the report is made available on the Archive web site as a supplement to the 2004 Codebook.

## **Summary of the findings**

### **Language(s) and translation**

(see pages 15–23 of the Findings Chart)

From 1999 on, the SMQ asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. All of the thirty-two countries that produced translations<sup>1</sup> checked or evaluated them (the Swiss Italian translation is an exception). Seventeen countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire<sup>2</sup> (Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Israel, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sweden, and Uruguay). The Philippines and South Africa fielded in five languages, Switzerland and Israel in three languages and Canada, Finland, Latvia, and Slovakia in two languages. All the other member countries fielded in one language.

Some countries reported translation problems (Germany, Flanders, Japan, Norway, the Netherlands, Slovakia<sup>5</sup>, Sweden and Venezuela).

### **Survey question coverage and context**

(see pages 24-26 of the Findings Chart)

Six countries (Brazil, Flanders, Japan, Poland, Taiwan, and South Africa) did not include all of the core items. Four members (Flanders, Japan, Poland, and Taiwan) omitted background variables, usually by mistake.

In 2004, twenty-five countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. A question in the SMQ asking for information about studies (topic, study title, etc.) the ISSP was fielded with is included in the report (see appendix).

---

<sup>1</sup> Austria not counted since it did not produce a translation on its own.

<sup>2</sup> Finland did a pre-test for the Finnish but not for the Swedish version. The Philippines did a pre-test for Tagalog but not for the other four languages the survey was fielded in.

<sup>5</sup> Slovakia reported translation problems for the translation into Slovak.

## **Sampling**

(see pages 27- 33 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2004 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. Two countries, Brazil and Venezuela, seem to be using quota procedures at the stage of respondents' selection. Eight reported using substitution of different kinds: Brazil, Chile, Cyprus, Latvia, the Philippines, Russia, Spain, and Uruguay. Finland and France had a lower age cut-off at 15 years, Japan, the Netherlands, and South Africa had a cut-off at 16 years; all other members had a lower age cut-off at 18 years of age. Six countries reported an upper age cut-off (Finland at 74, Flanders at 85, Latvia at 75, Norway and Sweden at 79, Venezuela at 80).

## **Data collection**

(see pages 34-42 of the Findings Chart)

### **MODES**

Essentially the ISSP questionnaires are administered as face-to-face interviews or in a self-completion format. Three countries combined several modes in fielding, usually as a result of fielding the ISSP module together with another study and administering the background variables for both studies face-to-face and the ISSP as self-completion (Flanders, Germany, and South Korea).

Three countries using an interviewer-administered mode had two advance contacts, letter and telephone call (Portugal, Taiwan and the USA). Eight countries had advance letters (Flanders, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Japan, Poland, Slovenia, and Switzerland); South Korea had a telephone pre-contact. Nine countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 41-42). Of these, Australia, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden had four or more, Canada, Finland and New Zealand had three, Denmark and France had two mailings. The number of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response (Dillman 2000). Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden had a telephone reminder. In Denmark, about 10% of the interviews were collected by telephone; the mode variable identifies these. Telephone interviews are not permitted in the ISSP.

### **INCENTIVES**

Nine countries reported they had used incentives (Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the USA). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.



## FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding for the 2003 module range from 2003 to 2006:

2003	2 countries
2004	22 countries
2004-2005	4 countries
2005	8 countries
2006	2 countries

Japan had the shortest fielding period, with nine days, Denmark, Great Britain and Israel had the longest, with about 28 weeks.

In twenty-three of twenty-nine countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week; in four countries at different times of day only (Latvia, South Korea, Spain, and Taiwan); and in one country at different days in week only (Brazil). One country did not report on interview approaches.

Countries differ considerably in the number of required contact attempts. The minimum required number of calls at an address or a household ranges from none (Cyprus, USA<sup>3</sup>) to five (Austria, Ireland, Slovenia, South Korea, and Switzerland). Fourteen countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 1%-100%). With one exception (Japan), countries using interviewer-administered modes back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 5%-100%).

## Information on response and outcome figures

(see pages 43-44 of the Findings Chart)

Quota procedures, substitution, and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the three main obstacles to calculating response rates for some of the ISSP 2004 studies (cf. reasons mentioned in the Park and Jowell report (1997) and expanded in the overview of the 1996-1998 monitoring studies, Harkness, Langfeldt, and Scholz, 2001). Members also differ in their definitions of outcome codes – of what counts as “eligible“, “ineligible“, or “partially completed interviews“, and so forth.

The raw figures for eligible samples and final outcomes indicate, nevertheless, that the range in the ISSP is considerable – from about 15% to over 95% for the module.

---

<sup>3</sup> USA with no fixed minimum; most difficult cases are approached 10 or more times.

## **Data**

(see pages 45-48 of the Findings Chart)

The great majority of members employed various measures of coding reliability, for the most part logic or consistency checks and range checks, followed by either individual or automatic corrections or both.

Twenty-two of thirty-eight countries applied subsequent weights or post-stratification to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

## **Documentation**

(see page 49 of the Findings Chart)

Twenty countries reported they had a national methods report available (Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Flanders, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, and USA). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

## **References**

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (2006): Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Lenexa, Kansas: AAPOR. (available online [http://www.aapor.org/pdfs/standarddefs\\_4.pdf](http://www.aapor.org/pdfs/standarddefs_4.pdf))

American Association for Public Opinion Research (2005): Best Practices for Survey and Public Opinion Research. (available online [http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey\\_methods/standards\\_and\\_best\\_practices/best\\_practices\\_for\\_survey\\_and\\_public\\_opinion\\_research](http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey_methods/standards_and_best_practices/best_practices_for_survey_and_public_opinion_research))

Dillman, D. A. (2000): Mail and Internet Surveys. The Tailored Design Method. 2. Edition. New York: Wiley.

Harkness, J. (2008) "Comparative Survey Research: Goals and Challenges." Foundation chapter" in De Leeuw, E., Hox, J. and Dillman, D. (eds.) *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Hyattsville, VA: Erlbaum.

Harkness, J. (1999): In Pursuit of Quality: Issues for Cross-national Survey Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 2: 125-140.

Harkness, J., Langfeldt, B. and Scholz, E. (2001): ISSP Study Monitoring 1996-1998, Reports to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany, Mai 2001. (available online with the 1996-1998 codebooks)

Lyberg, L., Biemer, P. P., Collins, M., De Leeuw, E. D., Dippo, C., Schwarz, N., Trewin, D. (1997): *Survey Measurement and Process Quality*. New York: Wiley.

Lynn, P., Japac, L., and Lyberg, L. (2006): What's So Special About Cross-National Surveys? In J. A. Harkness (ed.) *Conducting Cross-National and Cross-Cultural Surveys. Papers from the 2005 Meeting of the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI)*. Mannheim: ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial, 12: 7-20.

Lynn, P. (2001): *Developing Quality Standards for Cross-National Survey Research: Five Approaches*, Working Papers of the Institute for Social and Economic Research, paper 2001-21. Colchester: University of Essex.

Mohler, P. Ph., B.-E. Pennell, and Hubbard, F. (2008): "Survey Documentation: Towards Professional Knowledge Management in Sample Surveys" in De Leeuw, E., Hox, J. and Dillman, D. (eds.) *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Hyattsville, VA: Erlbaum.

Mohler, P. Ph. and Uher, R. (2003): Documenting Comparative Surveys for Secondary Analysis, in J. A. Harkness, F. J. R. Van de Vijver, and P. Ph. Mohler (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Survey Methods*, New York: Wiley.

Park, A. and Jowell, R. (1997): Consistencies and differences in a cross-national survey. The International Social Survey Programme (1995). (available online with the 1995 codebook)

Scholz, E. and Klein, S. (2003): Study Monitoring in the ISSP, ZUMA-Nachrichten, 52: 139-152.

**Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2004<sup>1</sup>**  
 (based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2006: Australia to Denmark)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Australia (1984)	1996	✓	No	Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
Austria (1985)	1996	No	No	Chile (1997)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
Bangladesh (1997) - (2003)	1996		No	Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓			1997	✓	✓
	1998	No			1998	✓	No
	1999	No			1999	✓	✓
	2000	(TP)	No		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
Brazil (1999)	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
	1996				2003	No	
	1997				2004	✓	✓
	1998	(TP)	(✓)	Czech Republic (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1997	✓	✓
	2000	No			1998	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2003	No			2001	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
					2003	✓	✓
Bulgaria (1991)	1996	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓	Denmark (1998)	1996		
	1998	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2001	No			2000	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
					2004	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

<sup>1</sup> Croatia, the Dominican Republic and Turkey are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Croatia joined the ISSP in 2005; the Dominican Republic and Turkey in 2006. Common ISSP membership by Flanders and Walloon since 2006; 2000-2005 ISSP membership by Flanders only.

**Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2004**  
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2006: Finland to Japan)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Finland (2000)	1996			Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
Flanders (2000)	1996			Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000				2000	✓	✓
	2001				2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	No			2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
France (1995)	1996	✓	✓	Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓	Italy (2001-2004)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(No)	
	2000	✓	✓		2000	(No)	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003		
	2004	✓	✓		2004		
Great Britain & Northern Ireland* (1984)	1996	✓	✓	Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

\* 2003 and 2004 without Northern Ireland

**Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2004**  
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2006: Latvia to Slovak Republic)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓	Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	??
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
Mexico (2000)	1996			Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	No			2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
Netherlands (1985)	1996	No		Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	*	*		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓	Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓	Slovak Republic (1996, re- instated)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

\* data delivery late; not integrated in common data file

**Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2004**  
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2006: Slovenia to Venezuela)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Slovenia (1992)	1996	✓	✓	Switzerland (1999)	1996		✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	No
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
South Africa (2001, re-instituted)	1996			Taiwan (2001)	1996		
	1997				1997		
	1998				1998		
	1999				1999		
	2000				2000		
	2001	✓	✓		2001		
	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
South Korea (2003)	2003	✓	✓	Uruguay (2003)	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	1996				1996		
	1997				1997		
	1998				1998		
	1999				1999		
	2000				2000		
Spain (1993)	2001			USA (1984)	2001		
	2002	✓	✓		2002		
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	1996	✓	✓		1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
Sweden (1992)	1999	✓	✓	Venezuela (1999)	1999		
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

**Monitoring Findings Chart  
2004  
for**

**Austria (A)  
Australia (AUS)  
Bulgaria (BG)  
Brazil (BR)  
Canada (CDN)  
Switzerland (CH)  
Chile (CL)  
Cyprus (CY)  
Czech Republic (CZ)  
Denmark (DK)  
Germany (D)  
Spain (E)  
France (F)  
Finland (FIN)  
Flanders (FL)  
Great Britain (GB)  
Hungary (H)  
Israel (IL)  
Ireland (IRL)  
Japan (J)  
Latvia (LV)  
Mexico (MEX)  
Norway (N)  
Netherlands (NL)  
New Zealand (NZ)  
Portugal (P)  
Poland (PL)  
South Korea (ROK)  
Uruguay (ROU)  
The Philippines (RP)  
Russia (RUS)  
Sweden (S)  
Slovak Republic (SK)  
Slovenia (SLO)  
Taiwan (TW)  
United States of America (USA)  
Venezuela (YV)  
South Africa (ZA)**



### Language(s) and translation

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	German	English	Bulgarian	Portuguese	English	German	Spanish	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	French
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>					French	French							
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>						Italian							
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>													
<b>Yes, translated:</b>	X <sup>A</sup>								X <sup>CZ</sup>				
<b>- by member(s) of research team</b>			X	X		L2	X	X		X	X	X	X
<b>- by translation bureau</b>													
<b>- by specially trained translator(s)</b>			X		L2	L1, L3	X			X			
<b>No, not translated</b>		X											

<sup>A</sup> Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

<sup>CZ</sup> 2 independent translations from bureaus combined and supercontrolled by member of the team

Translation (continued)

	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	Dutch	English	Portuguese
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>	Swedish				Arabic			Russian					
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>					Russian								
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>													
<b>Yes, translated:</b>													
- by member(s) of research team				X			X	L1, L2		X	X		X
- by translation bureau	L1, L2	X					X						
- by specially trained translator(s)					L1-3				X				
- other													
<b>No, not translated</b>			X			X						X	

**Translation (continued)**

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	English
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>				Ilocano			Hungarian					Afrikaans
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>				Bicolano								Zulu
<b>Language 4 (L4)</b>				Cebuano								Tswana
<b>Language 5 (L5)</b>				Ilonggo								Venda
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>												
<b>Yes, translated:</b>												
<b>- by member(s) of research team</b>	X	X	X	L1				X	X			
<b>- by translation bureau</b>							L1, L2				X	
<b>- by specially trained translator(s)</b>	X				X	X						L2-5
<b>- other</b>				L2-5								
<b>No, not translated</b>										X		L1

### Translation (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	German	English	Bulgarian	Portuguese	English	German	Spanish	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	French
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>					French	French							
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>						Italian							
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>													
<b>Yes:</b>													
- group discussion			X	X		L2	X	X		X			X
- expert checked it			X						X	X		X	X
- back translation					L2								
- other						L1					X <sup>DK</sup>		
<b>No</b>						L3							
<b>Not applicable</b>	X <sup>A</sup>	X											

<sup>DK</sup> Two members of the research team carried out a translation independently of each other. On the basis of these a third member made the final translation.

<sup>A</sup> Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

### Translation (continued)

	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	Dutch	English	Portuguese
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>	Swedish				Arabic			Russian					
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>					Russian								
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>													
<b>Yes:</b>													
- group discussion				X	L1-3			L1, L2	X	X	X		X
- expert checked it	L1, L2	X									X		
- back translation									X				
- other							X <sup>J</sup>						
<b>No</b>													
<b>Not applicable</b>			X			X						X	

<sup>J</sup> An English bilingual checked the translation.

**Translation (continued)**

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	English
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>				Ilocano			Hungarian					Afrikaans
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>				Bicolano								Zulu
<b>Language 4 (L4)</b>				Cebuano								Tswana
<b>Language 5 (L5)</b>				Ilonggo								Venda
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>												
<b>Yes:</b>												
- group discussion	X	X	X	L1		X		X	X		X	
- expert checked it	X				X		L1, L2		X			L2-5
- back translation												
- other				L1-5								
<b>No</b>												
<b>Not applicable</b>										X		L1

**Translation (continued)**

	<b>A</b>	<b>AUS</b>	<b>BG</b>	<b>BR</b>	<b>CDN</b>	<b>CH</b>	<b>CL</b>	<b>CY</b>	<b>CZ</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	German	English	Bulgarian	Portuguese	English	German	Spanish	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	French
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>					French	French							
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>						Italian							
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>													
<b>Yes</b>			X	X		L1-3	X	X				X	
<b>No</b>					L2				X	X	X		X
<b>Not applicable</b>	X <sup>A</sup>	X											
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>													
<b>Yes</b>										X			
<b>No</b>			X	X	L2	L1-3	X	X	X		X	X	X
<b>Not applicable</b>	X <sup>A</sup>	X											

<sup>A</sup> Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

**Translation (continued)**

	<b>FIN</b>	<b>FL</b>	<b>GB</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>IL</b>	<b>IRL</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>LV</b>	<b>MEX</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>NL</b>	<b>NZ</b>	<b>P</b>
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>													
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	Dutch	English	Portuguese
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>	Swedish				Arabic			Russian					
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>					Russian								
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>													
<b>Yes</b>	L1	X		X					X				X
<b>No</b>	L2				L1-3		X	L1, L2		X	X		
<b>Not applicable</b>			X			X						X	
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>													
<b>Yes</b>		X					X			X	X		
<b>No</b>	L1, L2			X	L1-3			L1, L2	X				X
<b>Not applicable</b>			X			X						X	



Translation (continued)

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
<b>Language 1 (L1)</b>	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	English
<b>Language 2 (L2)</b>				Ilocano			Hungarian					Afrikaans
<b>Language 3 (L3)</b>				Bicolano								Zulu
<b>Language 4 (L4)</b>				Cebuano								Tswana
<b>Language 5 (L5)</b>				Ilonggo								Venda
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>												
<b>Yes</b>		X		L1					X		X	
<b>No</b>	X		X	L2-5	X	X	L1, L2	X				L2-5
<b>Not applicable</b>										X		L1
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>												
<b>Yes</b>						X	L1				X	
<b>No</b>	X	X	X	L1-5	X		L2	X	X			L2-5
<b>Not applicable</b>										X		L1

### Survey context

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																			
<b>Individual survey</b>				X				X			X	X	X	X				X	
<b>Larger survey:</b>																			
- with ISSP at start		X			X				X										X
- with ISSP in middle	X		X			X	X										X		
- with ISSP at end										X					X	X			

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																			
<b>Individual survey</b>	X	X	X		X								X	X					
<b>Larger survey:</b>																			
- with ISSP at start				X		X				X					X	X		X	
- with ISSP in middle							X					X							X
- with ISSP at end								X	X		X						X		

### Question coverage and order

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>No</b>																			
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																			
<b>Yes, all included</b>	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
<b>No, not all included:</b>																			
- from module				X															
- background items															X				

**Question coverage and order (continued)**

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>No</b>																			
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																			
<b>Yes, all included</b>		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
<b>No, not all included:</b>																			
- from module																			X
- background items	X							X								X			

## Sampling

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																			
...only adult citizens of country	X	X					X	X	X			X			X			X	
...adults of any nationality			X	X	X	X				X	X		X	X		X	X		X
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																			
... <u>private</u> accommodation only	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
... <u>private &amp; institutional</u> accommodation		X		X							X				X				
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																			
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
17																			
16																			
15													X	X					

### Sampling (continued)

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																			
...only adult citizens of country	X								X		X		X	X		X			X
...adults of any nationality		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X			X		X	X	
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																			
... <u>private</u> accommodation only		X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
... <u>private &amp; institutional</u> accommodation	X			X		X													
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																			
18		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
17																			
16	X				X														X
15																			

### Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																			
Yes																			
Age														74	85				
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>																			
Yes		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	
No	X		X								X		X		X				X
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																			
One stage		X									X			X					
Two stages			X		X					X			X		X		X		X
Three stages						X	X	X	X										
Four or more stages	X			X								X				X		X	

### Sampling (continued)

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>																			
<b>Age</b>		75		79									79					80	
<b>No</b>	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
<b>No</b>				X		X			X				X	X					
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																			
<b>One stage</b>				X		X							X						
<b>Two stages</b>	X				X										X				
<b>Three stages</b>		X					X	X	X					X		X	X	X	X
<b>Four or more stages</b>			X							X	X	X							



### Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																			
Addresses			X										X			X		X	
Households	X			X	X	X			X										
Named individuals (target persons)		X								X	X			X	X		X		
Named individuals (not the target persons)																			X
Areas								X				X <sup>E</sup>							
Something else							X <sup>CL</sup>												
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																			
Kish grid						X	X	X	X			X				X		X	
Birthday method			X		X								X						X
Quota				X															
Other	X <sup>A</sup>																		
Not applicable		X								X	X			X	X		X		

<sup>E</sup> Census blocks.

<sup>CL</sup> Use of census data; for urban areas: list of population by province, borough, district, zone and block;  
for rural areas: list of population by province, borough, district, locality and entity.

<sup>A</sup> Random sampling.

### Sampling (continued)

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																			
Addresses		X					X												
Households									X			X		X			X		X
Named individuals (target persons)	X			X		X		X					X		X	X			
Named individuals (not the target persons)																			
Areas			X							X	X							X	
Something else					X <sup>NL</sup>														
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																			
Kish grid			X								X						X		X
Birthday method		X			X		X		X	X		X		X					
Quota																		X	
Other																			
Not applicable	X			X		X		X					X		X	X			

<sup>NL</sup> Sampling frame consisted of an address register combined with a phone register.

### Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>				X <sup>4</sup>			X <sup>1,2,3</sup>	X <sup>2</sup>				X <sup>1,2</sup>							
<b>No</b>	X	X	X		X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>		X <sup>2</sup>								X <sup>1,2</sup>	X <sup>1,2,3</sup>	X <sup>1,2</sup>							
<b>No</b>	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X

<sup>1</sup> Substitution of refusals.

<sup>2</sup> Substitution of non-contacts, people away during survey period, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Substitution of sample points.

<sup>4</sup> Substitution permitted until pre-designed quotas are fulfilled.

## Data collection

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive &amp; background )?</i>																			
Face-to-face	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X <sup>b</sup>		X			X <sup>b</sup>		X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)										X <sup>s</sup>					X <sup>s</sup>	X			
Self-completion by mail		X			X						X <sup>DK</sup>		X	X					
Telephone											X <sup>DK</sup>								
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																			
2 weeks or less			X									X							
Over 2 weeks < 1 month				X			X										X		
1 month < 2 mths	X				X				X					X					X
2 months < 3 mths								X											
3 mths or more		X				X				X	X		X		X	X		X	
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																			
2003																			X
2004	X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
2005		X	X			X	X				X		X					X	
2006				X															

<sup>b</sup> background variables

<sup>s</sup> substantive variables

<sup>DK</sup> 89,6 % of respondents responded by mail; 10,4 % of interviews were completed as telephone interviews.

**Data collection (continued)**

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive &amp; background )?</i>																			
<b>Face-to-face</b>		X	X				X	X	X <sup>ROK</sup>	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)</b>	X								X <sup>ROK</sup>										
<b>Self-completion by mail</b>				X	X	X							X						
<b>Telephone</b>																			
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																			
<b>2 weeks or less</b>	X		X											X					
<b>Over 2 weeks &lt; 1 month</b>		X						X			X	X						X	
<b>1 month &lt; 2 mths</b>				X						X					X	X			X
<b>2 months &lt; 3 mths</b>						X			X				X						
<b>3 mths or more</b>					X		X										X		
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																			
<b>2003</b>															X				
<b>2004</b>	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X
<b>2005</b>					X			X				X		X			X		
<b>2006</b>			X																

<sup>ROK</sup> 1222 interviews face-to-face; 90 self-completion

**Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement**

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>														
<b>Yes - postal components:</b>														
- advance letter				X				X		X	X	X		
- reminder & thank you letters										X				
<b>Yes - telephone components</b>														
<b>No</b>	X	X	X		X	X	X		X				X	X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>														
<b>Yes</b>				X										
<b>No</b>	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>														
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <sup>D</sup>	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>No</b>														

<sup>D</sup> Interviewers are paid per interview plus expenses.

**Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)**

	J	LV	MEX	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>															
<b>Yes - postal components:</b>															
- advance letter	X			X	X						X	X	X		
- reminder & thank you letters															
<b>Yes - telephone components</b>				X		X						X	X		
<b>No</b>		X	X				X	X	X	X				X	X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>															
<b>Yes</b>	X					X			X			X	X		
<b>No</b>		X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X			X	X
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>															
<b>Yes</b>	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
<b>No</b>			X										X		

**Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)**

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>														
<b>Call at different time of day</b>		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Call on different days in week</b>		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
<b>None of these</b>	X													
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>														
<b>Yes:</b>														
<b>Minimum number of required calls</b>	5	2	3	5	3		3	4	3	4	4	3	4	5
<b>No</b>						X								
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>														
<b>Yes:</b>														
<b>Approximate proportion (%)</b>			20		8	20	30		100	100	2			
<b>No</b>	X	X		X				X				X	X	X



**Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)**

	J	LV	MEX	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>															
<b>Call at different time of day</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Call on different days in week</b>	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
<b>None of these</b>															
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>															
<b>Yes:</b>													X <sup>USA</sup>		
<b>Minimum number of required calls</b>	3	2	3	4	3	5	4	3	4	3	5	3		3	3
<b>No</b>															
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>															
<b>Yes:</b>															
<b>Approximate proportion (%)</b>			25			9		10				1	10	20	1
<b>No</b>	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X				

<sup>USA</sup> All cases are handled on an individual basis. There is no fixed minimum, but most difficult cases are approached in one way or another 10 or more times.

**Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)**

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>														
<b>Yes:</b>														
<b>Approximate proportion (%)</b>	15	10	20	20	41	10	30	100	10	15	10	10	30	10
<b>No</b>														

	J	LV	MEX	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>															
<b>Yes:</b>															
<b>Approximate proportion (%)</b>		10	5	30	7	89	39	30	15	25	60	30	20	20	20
<b>No</b>	X														

**Data collection: mail**

	AUS	CDN	DK	F	FIN	N	NL	NZ	S
<i>Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?</i>									
<b>Yes:</b>									
- reminders by telephone			X <sup>DK</sup>				X		X
<b>No</b>	X	X		X	X	X		X	
<i>What was sent out in the first mailing?</i>									
<b>Questionnaire</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
<b>Data protection information</b>	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
<b>Explanatory letter</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Incentive</b>						X		X	
<b>Other material</b>	X	X						X	
<i>What was sent out in the second mailing?</i>									
<b>Thank you and reminder combined</b>		X		X	X	X			
<b>Reminder sent only to non-respondents</b>	X		X					X	
<b>Questionnaire</b>			X	X			X		X
<b>Data protection information</b>				X			X		X
<b>Explanatory letter</b>				X			X		
<b>Incentive</b>									X
<b>Other material</b>	X								

<sup>DK</sup> Denmark used a telephone reminder after last mailing.

**Data collection: mail (continued)**

	AUS	CDN	DK	F	FIN	N	NL	NZ	S
<i>What was sent out in the third mailing?</i>									
<b>Questionnaire</b>	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
<b>Data protection information</b>	X	X			X	X			X
<b>Explanatory letter</b>	X	X			X	X	X	X	
<b>Incentive</b>						X			
<b>Other material</b>	X						X <sup>NL</sup>	X	X
<b>No third mailing</b>			X	X					
<i>What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?</i>									
<b>Questionnaire</b>						X	X <sup>NL</sup>		X
<b>Data protection information</b>						X			X
<b>Explanatory letter</b>						X			
<b>Reminder only to non-respondents</b>	X						X <sup>NL</sup>		
<b>Incentive</b>						X			
<b>Other material</b>									X
<b>No fourth mailing</b>		X	X	X	X			X	

<sup>NL</sup> Third mailing: reminder  
Fourth mailing: reminder  
Fifth mailing: questionnaire

### Information on response and outcome figures \*

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D <sup>D</sup>	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																			
<b>Issued sample (n)</b>	2200	5000	1700	2000	3000	2300	1505	1300	2965	2471/1132	2000	2600	10000	2500	2413	2067	2300	1901	1702
<b>Ineligible (n)</b>	531	4	135		126	146			144	242/109	33	56	52	10	72	189	67	132	88
<b>Eligible (n)</b>	1669	4996	1565		2874	2154	1505	1300	2821	2229/1023	1967	2544	9948	2490	2341	1878	2233	1769	1614
<b>- refusal (n)</b>	278	320	196		40	855	147	114	740	945/445	374	24		24	577	588	487	418	252
<b>- non-contact (n)</b>	385	2357	166		1596	45	99		618	159/58	155	39	8417	1110	164	100	161	257	220
<b>- other unproductive (n)</b>		391	78			176	17	182	141	120/41	252			2	202	206	550	60	52
<b>- completed cases (n)</b>	1006	1914	1121	2000	1228	1078	1505 <sup>CL</sup>	1000	1322	896/436	1180 <sup>DK</sup>	2481	1475	1354	1398	853	1035	1034	1065
<b>- partially completed (n)</b>		14	4		10			4		109/43	6		56			131			25

\* for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

<sup>D</sup> Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.

<sup>CL</sup> Substituted interviews (263) included.

<sup>DK</sup> 123 telephone interviews included (10,4% of interviews completed)

**Information on response and outcome figures (continued) \***

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																			
<b>Issued sample (n)</b>	1800	1893	1800	2499	4500	2500	2907	2106	2000	1389	1733	6304	2000	1400	1634	4012	2777	1337	3500
<b>Ineligible (n)</b>	65	108	59	99	101	247	99	204	31		3	222	27	5	113	153	553	43	118
<b>Eligible (n)</b>	1735	1785	1741	2400	4399	2253	2808	1902	1969	1389	1730	6082	1973	1395	1521	3859	2224	1294	3382
<b>- refusal (n)</b>	213	381	195	117	652	73	955	218	424	176	214	592	124	195	263	585	471	54	304
<b>- non-contact (n)</b>	6	376	249	848	1924	764	200	113	135	72	365	3275	462	86	105	1180	49	29	194
<b>- other unproductive(n)</b>	173	26	96	31		46	46	294	87	33	409	362	92	32	99	313	232	12	100
<b>- completed cases (n)</b>	1343	1000	1201	1404	1823	1370	1602	1277	1312	1108	1200 <sup>RP</sup>	1800	1295	1072	1052	1781	1472	1199	2775
<b>- partially completed (n)</b>		2					5		11		12	53		10	2				9

\* for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

<sup>RP</sup> Substituted interviews included.

## Data

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
<b>No</b>					X	X									X	X			
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>																			
<b>Yes:</b>																			
<b>Approximate proportion (%)</b>				20			100	10	100		99	100		2	100	100	10	15	100
<b>No</b>	X	X	X		X	X				X			X						
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
<b>No</b>	X				X													X	X

**Data (continued)**

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>		X	X	X				X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>No</b>	X				X	X	X					X							
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>																			
<b>Yes:</b>																			
<b>Approximate proportion (%)</b>	100		95	20			15		100		40		10	25		100		100	100
<b>No</b>		X			X	X		X		X		X			X		X		
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
<b>No</b>		X			X										X			X	X



**Data (continued)**

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																			
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																			
<b>Yes:</b>																			
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- automatically	X		X											X			X		
<b>No</b>																			
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>	X		X		X	X	X		X				X	X	X	X	X		X
<b>No</b>		X		X				X		X	X	X						X	

**Data (continued)**

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																			
- filters	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																			
Yes:																			
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
- automatically	X			X		X	X					X	X		X			X	X
No																			
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																			
Yes					X		X	X			X	X		X		X	X	X	X
No	X	X	X	X		X			X	X			X		X				

## Documentation

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CDN	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>	X	X		X	X	X	X			X					X	X	X		
<b>No</b>			X					X	X		X	X	X	X				X	X

	J	LV	MEX	N	NL	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																			
<b>Yes</b>				X	X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
<b>No</b>	X	X	X			X	X	X		X								X	X

## Appendix

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
1	Australia	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA) 2005: a biennial general social survey of Australian attitudes on subjects including work, education, families, crime, community, and taxes and government spending.
2	Austria	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with ISSP 2003 (National Identity II) with additional EU-questions.
3	Bulgaria	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with questions on daily problems.
4	Canada	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with ISSP 2003 (National Identity II).
5	Chile	The Citizenship 2004 ISSP module was carried out in conjunction with questions relating to Chilean political, economic, and social attitudes.
6	Czech Republic	ISSP 2004 was fielded with country specific questions on internal and external efficacy and trust attached at the end of the module. Complete data file will be made available in the archive SDA ( <a href="http://archiv.soc.cas.cz">http://archiv.soc.cas.cz</a> ).
7	Flanders	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with the annual survey “Social-cultural changes in Flanders”.
8	Germany	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with ISSP 2003 (National Identity II) and with ALLBUS (German General Social Survey). The ALLBUS 2004 deals with various topics such as health, social inequality or digital divide.
9	Great Britain	ISSP 2004 was fielded as part of the 22 <sup>nd</sup> British Social Attitudes Survey, 2004.
10	Hungary	ISSP 2004 questionnaire was asked as a part of the regular omnibus survey of TARKI, December 2004.
11	Ireland	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with ISSP 2003 (National Identity II).
12	New Zealand	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with a survey that included a small number of new Zealand-specific questions on republicanism and local political issues.
13	Norway	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with a survey on media malaise, political tolerance and social distance, geographical identity, political cleavages, political and cultural rights of minorities.
14	The Philippines	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with a survey on quality of life indicators, awareness of news events, performance ratings of government officials and functions, and evaluation of May 2004 elections.

<b>Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).</b>		
15	Poland	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with the Polish General Social Survey (PGSS).
16	Portugal	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with ISSP 2003 (National Identity II). Besides two national modules were added: one on attitudes towards immigrants and another one on “city, citizen, citizenship”.
17	Russia	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with a regular omnibus survey.
18	Slovenia	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with a general national survey with an accent on attitudes on political parties, elections, etc.
19	South Africa	ISSP 2004 was fielded as part of the South African Social Attitude Survey (SASAS). Other topics included in the survey were democracy and governance issues, national identity, service delivery, health status, HIV/Aids issues, moral issues, family and lifestyle issues and poverty.
20	South Korea	ISSP 2004 module (Citizenship) was fielded as part of the KGSS 2004 (Korean General Social Survey).
21	Switzerland	ISSP 2004 module was fielded together with the MOSAiCH 2005 (Measurement and Observation of Social Attitudes in Switzerland), which is the continuation of the “Eurobarometer in Switzerland”. The MOSAiCH survey 2005 contains questions on the relation of Switzerland to the EU (trust in institutions, geographical attachment...), a small module on social networks, a quite large socio-demographical part, and the ISSP modules 2004 and 2005.
22	Taiwan	ISSP 2004 module was fielded together with a survey on electoral participation, voting behaviour, national identification, party identification, globalization and emigration, religion and politics, social stratification and occupation, and social network.
23	Uruguay	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with ISSP 2003 (National Identity II).
24	USA	ISSP 2004 module was fielded together with the 2004 General Social Survey which includes core GSS variables and several topical modules such as work environment, immigration, genes, alcohol, voluntary association and social network, information society, sexual behaviour, and national identity.
25	Venezuela	ISSP 2004 module was fielded together with a study on violence and penal system in Venezuela.

## Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures

Report Category	Face-to-Face Questionnaire Category	Mail Questionnaire Category
Issued sample (n)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)
Ineligible (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addresses which could not be traced at all/ selected respondents who could not be traced</li> <li>- Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addresses which could not be traced</li> <li>- Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings</li> <li>- Details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.)</li> <li>- Addresses with no letter boxes</li> <li>- Selected respondent unknown at address</li> <li>- Selected respondent moved, no forwarding address</li> <li>- Selected respondent deceased</li> </ul>
Eligible (n)	Issued sample minus Ineligible	Issued sample minus Ineligible
Refusal (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Personal refusal at selected address</li> <li>- Proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent)</li> <li>- Other refusal at selected address</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refusal by selected respondent</li> <li>- Refusal by another person</li> <li>- Implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)</li> </ul>
Non-contact (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No contact at selected address</li> <li>- No contact with selected person</li> </ul>	No contact
Other unproductive (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate</li> <li>- Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey</li> <li>- Selected respondent away during survey period</li> <li>- Other type of unproductive reaction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate</li> <li>- Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey</li> <li>- Selected respondent away during survey period</li> <li>- Other type of unproductive reaction</li> </ul>
Completed cases (n)	Full productive interview	Completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)
Partially completed (n)	Partial productive interview	Partially completed returned questionnaires

## **ISSP Study Monitoring Questionnaires for Face-to-Face and Mail Surveys**

***INTERNATIONAL  
SOCIAL  
SURVEY  
PROGRAMME***

***Study Monitoring Questionnaire***

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE  
**CITIZENSHIP 2004** ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: Janet Harkness, ZUMA, PO Box 12 21 55, D-68072 Mannheim, [issp@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:issp@zuma-mannheim.de)



1a. Please enter the name of your institute and your country:

Institute:

Country:

1b. Please enter the name of the principal investigator and your contact person for questions about the study:

Principal  
Investigator:

Contact  
Person:

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research

☐

An institute principally doing academic research

☐

An institute doing both market and academic research

☐

Other (please write in details)

☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member  
institute itself

☐

OR

Institute  
name:

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

only in English

☐

→ Question 39

in English plus other language(s)

☐

→ Question 3b

only in translation

☐

→ Question 3b

3b. Please enter the language(s) the module was fielded in.

Please write in: Language 1 to Language X

4. Was the questionnaire for language 1 ...?

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 5

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 11

5. Who carried out translation 1? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

6. Was translation 1 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 7

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 7

No ☐ → Question 8

7. How was translation 1 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

8. Was the translation 1 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

9. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 1? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 11

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

10. What did you do about any problems in translation 1?

*Please enter details:*

11. Was the questionnaire for language 2 ...? (answer only if you have two or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 12

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 18

12. Who carried out translation 2? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

13. Was translation 2 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 14

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 14

No ☐ → Question 15

14. How was translation 2 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

15. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

16. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 18

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

17. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?

*Please enter details:*

18. Was the questionnaire for language 3 ...? **[answer only if you have three or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39]**

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 19  
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 25

19. Who carried out translation 3? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐  
A translation bureau ☐  
One or more specially trained translators ☐  
Other (please write in details) ☐

20. Was translation 3 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 21  
Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 21  
No ☐ → Question 22

21. How was translation 3 checked?

Group discussion ☐  
Expert checked it ☐  
Back translation ☐  
Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

22. Was the translation 3 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐  
No ☐

23. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 3? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 25

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

24. What did you do about any problems in translation 3?

*Please enter details:*

25. Was the questionnaire for language 4 ...? **(answer only if you have four or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)**

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 26

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 32

26. Who carried out translation 4? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

27. Was translation 4 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 28

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 28

No ☐ → Question 29

28. How was translation 4 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

29. Was the translation 4 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

30. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 4? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 32

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

31. What did you do about any problems in translation 4?

*Please enter details:*

32. Was the questionnaire for language 5 ...? **(answer only if you have five or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)**

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 33  
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 39

33. Who carried out translation 5? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐  
A translation bureau ☐  
One or more specially trained translators ☐  
Other (please write in details) ☐

34. Was translation 5 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 35  
Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 35  
No ☐ → Question 36

35. How was translation 5 checked?

Group discussion ☐  
Expert checked it ☐  
Back translation ☐  
Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

36. Was the translation 5 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐  
No ☐



37. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 5? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 39

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

38. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?

*Please enter details:*

39. What data collection methods were used for the module (substantive and background questions)?

Face-to-face ☐

Self-completion (with some interviewer involvement in delivering or collecting) ☐

'Mixed mode': part self-completion, part face-to-face (please write in details) ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*If 'mixed mode' or other, please write in:*

40. Were postal or telephone components used at any point (e.g., advance contacts)?

Yes - postal ☐ → Question 41

Yes - telephone ☐ → Question 41

No ☐ → Question 42

41. Please give details of the postal and/or telephone components.

*Please enter details:*

42. Were incentives offered?

Yes ☐

No ☐

43. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) ☐ → Question 46

As part of a larger survey ☐ → Question 44

44. Please provide information about the other stud(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

*Please enter:*

45. What was the approximate position of the Citizenship module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

46. Were the substantive questions in the Citizenship module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes ☐ → Question 48

Yes, apart from omissions ☐ → Question 47

No ☐ → Question 47

47. Why was the question order changed?

*Please enter:*

48. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all required substantive and background questions)?

Yes – all Citizenship questions and background questions included ☐ → Question 50

No – substantive question(s) from Citizenship module missing ☐ → Question 49

No – required background ISSP question(s) missing ☐ → Question 49

49. Please provide details of the questions missing and indicate why they are missing.

*ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:*

*Reason(s) why missing:*

Here we ask questions on sampling.

50. First, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adult citizens of your country? ☐

Adults of any nationality residing in your country? ☐

51. Second, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adults living in private accommodation? ☐ → Question 52

Adults living in private and in institutional accommodation  
(e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)? ☐

If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.

*Please enter in:*

52. Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN :

53. Was there any upper age cut-off for your sample?

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off ☐

54. Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your sample design, apart from the age cut-offs or citizenship requirements just asked about?

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

*If yes, write in details:*

55. Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes ☐ → Question 56

No ☐ → Question 57

56. Please describe the stratification variables used?

*Please write in:*

57. How many of stages does your sampling design have?

- One stage ☐
- Two stages ☐
- Three stages ☐
- Four stages ☐

58. Does your sampling frame consist of...?

- Addresses ☐
- Households ☐
- Named individuals (the target persons) ☐
- Named individuals (not the target persons) ☐
- Areas ☐
- Something else (please write in details) ☐

59. Please describe your sampling frame (e.g., population register, electoral roll, telephone directory and its coverage and updating).

*Please write in:*

60. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?

*Please write in:*

61. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stage?

**(only if you have two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)**

*Please write in:*

62. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the third stage?

(only if you have three or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

63. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the fourth stage?

(only if you have four stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

64. What selection method was used to identify a respondent?

Please tick all that apply. (do not answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are the target persons. Then continue with question 66)

Kish grid ☐

Last (or next) birthday ☐

Quota ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

65. Please describe your quota procedures. (only if you used quota, otherwise continue with question 66)

Please write in:

66. Was substitution or replacement permitted at any stage of your selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes ☐

→Question 67

No ☐

→Question 68

67. Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.

Please write in:

68. All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your net sample?  
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?

Please write in:

69. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.

Some categories may well not apply, but please complete to the highest level of detail possible.

Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)

--	--	--	--

- addresses which could not be traced at all  
selected respondents who could not be traced

--	--	--	--

- addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings

--	--	--	--

- selected respondent too sick/incapacitated to participate

--	--	--	--

- selected respondent away during survey period

--	--	--	--

- selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey

--	--	--	--

- no contact at selected address

--	--	--	--

- no contact with selected person

--	--	--	--

- personal refusal at selected address

--	--	--	--

- proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent)

--	--	--	--

- other refusal at selected address

--	--	--	--

- other type of unproductive reaction (please write in full details in the box below)

--	--	--	--

- full productive interview (net sample size)

--	--	--	--

- partial productive interview

--	--	--	--

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

70. Here we ask for information about interviewer procedures.

a. Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?

Yes ☐

No ☐

b. Which, if any, of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address/household?

*PLEASE TICK THOSE THAT APPLY*

Calls/visits must be made at different times of day ☐

Calls/visits must be made on different days of week ☐

Neither of the above ☐

c. Were interviewers required to make a certain number of calls/ visits before they stopped approaching an address or household?

Minimum number of calls/visits required - please write in number

No minimum call requirement ☐

d. Were any interviews supervised (that is, supervisor accompanies interviewer)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion   %

No ☐

e. Were any interviews back-checked (e.g. supervisor checks later whether interview conducted)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion   %

No ☐

71. Please write in the approximate start and end dates of fieldwork.

**D D M M Y Y**

Start date

End date

72. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

73. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification    %

No ☐



74. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables (that is variables constructed on the basis of other variables collected)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

No derived variables ☐

75. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?

Yes ☐

No ☐

76. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?

Yes ☐

No ☐

77. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?

Yes ☐

No ☐

**If you answered YES for any question from Q72 to Q77, continue with Question 78.  
If you answered NO for all questions Q72 to Q77, continue with Question 79.**

78. Were errors corrected?  
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individually ☐

Yes - automatically ☐

No - not corrected ☐

79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐

→ Question 80

No ☐

→ Question 81

80. Please briefly describe the weighting or post-stratification strategy used.

*Please write in:*

81. Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes ☐

No ☐

82. If there is anything you would like to comment on, please do so here.

*Please write in:*

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH**

***INTERNATIONAL  
SOCIAL  
SURVEY  
PROGRAMME***

***Study Monitoring Questionnaire***

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE  
**CITIZENSHIP 2004** ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: Janet Harkness, ZUMA, PO Box 12 21 55, D-68072 Mannheim, [issp@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:issp@zuma-mannheim.de)

1a. Please enter the name of your institute and your country:

Institute:

Country:

1b. Please enter the name of the principal investigator and your contact person for questions about the study:

Principal  
Investigator:

Contact  
Person:

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research

☐

An institute principally doing academic research

☐

An institute doing both market and academic research

☐

Other (please write in details)

☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member  
institute itself

☐

OR

Institute  
name:

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

only in English

☐

→ Question 34

in English plus other language(s)

☐

→ Question 3b

only in translation

☐

→ Question 3b

3b. Please enter the language(s) the module was fielded in.

Please write in: Language 1 to Language X

4. Who carried out translation 1? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team

☐

A translation bureau

☐

One or more specially trained translators

☐

Other (please write in details)

☐

5. Was translation 1 checked?

- Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 6  
Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 6  
No ☐ → Question 7

6. How was translation 1 checked?

- Group discussion ☐  
Expert checked it ☐  
Back translation ☐  
Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

7. Was the translation 1 questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes ☐  
No ☐

8. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 1? Please tick all that apply.

- No problems ☐ → Question 10  
Answer scales ☐  
Instructions ☐  
Whole questions ☐  
Words or concepts ☐  
Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

9. What did you do about any problems in translation 1?

*Please enter details:*

10. Who carried out translation 2? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have two or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

11. Was translation 2 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 12

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 12

No ☐ → Question 13

12. How was translation 2 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

13. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

14. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 16

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

15. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?

*Please enter details:*

16. Who carried out translation 3? Please tick all that apply.

**answer only if you have three or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)**

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

17. Was translation 3 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 18

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 18

No ☐ → Question 19

18. How was translation 3 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

19. Was the translation 3 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

20. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 3? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 22

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

21. What did you do about any problems in translation 3?

*Please enter details:*



22. Who carried out translation 4? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have four or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

23. Was translation 4 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 24

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 24

No ☐ → Question 25

24. How was translation 4 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

25. Was the translation 4 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

26. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 4? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 28

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

27. What did you do about any problems in translation 4?

*Please enter details:*

28. Who carried out translation 5? Please tick all that apply.

**(answer only if you have five or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)**

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

29. Was translation 5 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 30

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 30

No ☐ → Question 31

30. How was translation 5 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in:*

31. Was the translation 5 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

32. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 5? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 34

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

*Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:*

33. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?

*Please enter details:*

34. Here we ask questions on your mail survey.

- a. Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?  
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - precontacts by telephone ☐

Yes - precontacts by personal visit ☐

Yes - reminders by telephone ☐

Yes - reminders by personal visit ☐

Yes - Other (please write in details) ☐

**No** - no telephone or personal (visit) contacts at all ☐

- b. How many mailings were sent out during fielding? Please enter number:

- c. What were the dates of mailings? (with multiple mailings, provide dates for the first three and the last)

1      d d m m y y y y

2      d d m m y y y y

3      d d m m y y y y

4      d d m m y y y y

- d. What was sent out in each mailing? Please check all that apply.

1. Mailing:

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Mailing (answer only if you have two or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Thank you and reminder combined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thank you sent only to respondents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Mailing (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e. When did the fielding period finish officially?

d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

35. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) ☐ →Question 38

As part of a larger survey ☐ →Question 36

36. Please provide information about the other stud(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

*Please enter:*

37. What was the approximate position of the Citizenship module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

38. Were the substantive questions in the Citizenship module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes ☐ →Question 40

Yes, apart from omissions ☐ →Question 39

No ☐ →Question 39

39. Why was the question order changed?

*Please enter:*

40. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all required substantive and background questions)?

Yes – all Citizenship questions and background questions included ☐ → Question 42

No – substantive question(s) from Citizenship module missing ☐ → Question 41

No – required background ISSP question(s) missing ☐ → Question 41

41. Please provide details of the questions missing and indicate why they are missing.

*ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:*

*Reason(s) why missing:*

Here we ask questions on sampling.

42. First, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adult citizens of your country? ☐

Adults of any nationality residing in your country? ☐

43. Second, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adults living in private accommodation? ☐ → Question 44

Adults living in private and in institutional accommodation  
(e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)? ☐

If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.

*Please enter in:*

44. Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN :

45. Was there any upper age cut-off for your sample?

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off ☐

46. Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your sample design, apart from the age cut-offs or citizenship requirements just asked about?

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

*If yes, write in details:*

47. Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes ☐

→Question 48

No ☐

→Question 49

48. Please describe the stratification variables used?

*Please write in:*

49. How many of stages does your sampling design have?

One stage ☐

Two stages ☐

Three stages ☐

Four stages ☐

50. Does your sampling frame consist of...?

Addresses ☐

Households ☐

Named individuals (the target persons) ☐

Named individuals (not the target persons) ☐

Areas ☐

Something else (please write in details) ☐



51. Please describe your sampling frame (e.g., population register, electoral roll, telephone directory and its coverage and updating).

*Please write in:*

52. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?

*Please write in:*

53. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stage?  
(only if you have two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

*Please write in:*

54. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the third stage?  
(only if you have three or more stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

*Please write in:*

55. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the fourth stage?  
(only if you have four stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

*Please write in:*

56. What selection method was used to identify a respondent?

Please tick all that apply. (do not answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are the target persons. Then continue with question 58)

Kish grid ☐

Last (or next) birthday ☐

Quota ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

57. Please describe your quota procedures. (only if you used quota, otherwise continue with question 58)

*Please write in:*

58. Was substitution or replacement permitted at any stage of your selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes ☐

→Question 59

No ☐

→Question 60

59. Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.

*Please write in:*

60. All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your net sample?  
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?

*Please write in:*

61. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.

Some categories may well not apply, but please complete to the highest level of detail possible.

Total number of <u>starting</u> or <u>issued</u> names/addresses (gross sample size)	<input type="text"/>
- addresses which could not be traced	<input type="text"/>
- addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings	<input type="text"/>
- details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.)	<input type="text"/>
- addresses with no letter boxes	<input type="text"/>
selected respondent unknown at address	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent moved, no forwarding address	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent deceased	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent away during survey period	<input type="text"/>
- refusal by selected respondent	<input type="text"/>
- refusal by another person	<input type="text"/>
- partial productive interview	<input type="text"/>
- implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)	<input type="text"/>
- other type of unproductive reaction (please write in full details in the box below)	<input type="text"/>
- completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)	<input type="text"/>
- partially completed returned questionnaires	<input type="text"/>
- no contact	<input type="text"/>

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

*Please write in:*

62. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

63. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification  %

No ☐

64. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables (that is, variables constructed on the basis of other variables collected)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

No derived variables ☐

65. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?

Yes ☐

No ☐

66. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?

Yes ☐

No ☐

67. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?

Yes ☐

No ☐

**If you answered YES for any question from Q62 to Q67, continue with Question 68.  
If you answered NO for all questions Q62 to Q67, continue with Question 69.**

68. Were errors corrected?  
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individually ☐

Yes - automatically ☐

No - not corrected ☐

69. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐ → Question 70

No ☐ → Question 71

70. Please briefly describe the weighting or post-stratification strategy used.

*Please write in:*

71. Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes ☐

No ☐

72. If there is anything you would like to comment on, please do so here.

*Please write in:*

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH**